

their market share worldwide but also, at the same time, provide mechanisms for the national security agency and the intelligence community to make sure that they were being consulted when this technology was being sold.

In a meeting I had with Deputy Secretary of Defense John Hamre just 1 hour ago in my office, he told me that tomorrow the administration will be announcing what I think will be a successful compromise that will allow industry to be happy but will allow those of us who have security concerns to be happy that we are, in fact, not giving away capability to our adversaries that may come back to haunt us.

This compromise which has yet to be worked out in terms of legislative language will do three things. It will allow a process to be kept in place to make sure that our intelligence and defense community have a process before an application is granted for an encrypted software to be sold overseas above the 64-bit strength capability. This gives our technical people the ability to monitor the kind of software encryption that we are selling so that they understand the implications of the sale.

Secondarily, the companies will certify the end user of this encrypted algorithm software so that we know where the encryption is going, to make sure it is not going near the hands of a terrorist group or perhaps a nation that is a direct opponent of the U.S., thus could cause security problems for us.

The third provision would allow the Defense Department and the administration and intelligence community to oppose the sale of this more capable encryption to a nation or to an entity that we feel would pose a security threat to America.

Based on these three conditions, the administration and Dr. Hamre are going to announce this change tomorrow, and I am convinced that this change would not have occurred were it not for the efforts of members of the national security committee, and Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence who stood up and cast very difficult votes.

The intense lobbying campaign by the private software companies who have significant PACs and who were having a significant influence on Republican and Democrat Members brought tremendous pressure to bear on many Members who wanted to make sure that our security was not being jeopardized.

In last year's vote in the House Subcommittee on Defense and last year's Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence and in this year's votes in the House Subcommittee on Defense and Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, Democrats and Republicans stood together.

They said that we want to make sure, in spite of the tremendous pressure by these software companies, that we give every possible consideration to our se-

curity concerns. Those security concerns apparently are now being met. Tomorrow we will hear the outline of the specifics from the administration.

I have offered my support to Dr. Hamre to work to develop bipartisan legislation to amend the Safe Act, the Goodlatte bill, to provide for a compromised solution to what has been a stalemate in this country over the exportation of encrypted software.

I want to particularly thank the Members of Congress who were leaders in this effort and who, without their support, this compromise would not have occurred.

On the Committee on Armed Services in particular, I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY). He was the cosponsor of the amendment that I offered this year which passed in the committee with a vote of 46 to 8. Overwhelming support by Republicans and Democrats. That bipartisan support was obtained because of the leadership of the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SISISKY) on the Democrat side.

I would also thank our distinguished ranking member the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SKELTON) who took a leadership role in this effort in the committee, supported by the gentleman from South Carolina (Chairman SPENCE).

The other leaders on the Committee on Armed Services were the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS), the gentleman from Hawaii (Mr. ABERCROMBIE), and the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. GIBBONS). Each of these Members took the tough stand. They stood up under tremendous pressure and intense lobbying by private industry to say that we had to stand up for the security concerns of the intelligence community, the national security agency.

It is because of their efforts and the efforts of the leaders on the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, particularly the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GOSS) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. DICKS) that we were able to reach this compromise which, hopefully, all of us can rally around legislatively. I am looking forward to working together to achieve a balance.

I have already discussed this in a very preliminary way with the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) who is the chief sponsor of this legislation. I want to applaud him for being responsive to our reaching out to try to find a way to deal with the concerns of industry and their economic success and the concerns that we have relative to America's security.

Mr. Speaker, the real topic that I wanted to address tonight is the beginning of what I think will be a major national debate over the next 14 months that should occur over the issue of who lost Russia.

Mr. Speaker, 8 years ago the people inside of the Communist-dominated Soviet Union were excited, were anxious, and were looking forward to what they saw coming: A major revolution

of a Communist-dominated superpower, one of only two superpowers in the world at that time, that was repressive of their rights, that was repressive of the freedom of information and access to the kinds of freedoms we enjoy in America in free markets. The Soviet people were just chomping at the bit to throw off communism and become a free market democratic nation.

□ 1715

What happened? That revolution occurred. Gorbachev started it in a very heroic manner, followed by Boris Yeltsin, who, again in a very heroic manner, held the effort to lead the Soviet Union away from communism, away from a closed central economy to free markets and democracies.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, here we are 8 years later, those Russian people who for 70 years were dominated by communism are today looking back and they are saying to America, where is the realization of the dream that you promised? Where is the success of our economy? Where are the freedoms from the kinds of oppression and criminal activity that we see all over our country today? Where is the growth of our country economically as a major player in the world's economy? Where is the economic benefit?

Instead, many of those same people are worse off today than they were under communism. Senior citizens, who rely on pensions, have seen inflation running up in the hundreds and thousands of percentage increases over the last 8 years, have looked at their savings dwindle to nothing. The people who have relied on job growth have not seen any significant job increase except for a very small percentage of Russians, many of whom were connected to Yeltsin's inner circle, members of the *Intelligencia*, or, ironically, members who were well connected to the communist leadership of the previous 70 years.

In fact, Mr. Speaker, the amount of dismay in Russia today is unbelievable. I think it was best summed up by a member of the Russian Duma who I had the pleasure of doing a press conference with at the height of our bombing of Kosovo, which the Russians found offensive and because it did not initially involve them, found the running contradictory to our trying to improve relations.

He said, for 72 years, the Soviet communist party spent billions of dollars to try to convince the Russian people that America and its people were evil. But the Russian people, the 95 percent who were never able to join the communist party, did not believe the propaganda, did not believe the rhetoric coming out of Moscow that America was an evil nation. They rejected the plea of the communists that America was their long-term enemy.

He went on to say that, in a matter of a few short months and years, we have managed to do what the Soviet